

14th March 1928]

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"Sir, I made that statement in view of the statement made by the Leader of the Swarajya Party in the Press. I think I ought to be allowed to touch on that considering that you allowed my hon. Friend to give an explanation."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"With regard to the permission I have given to Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, it is to give him an opportunity to vindicate his conduct before the House, but here the hon. the Chief Minister wants to give the reasons why he made a particular statement. I do not think the reasons would constitute any element of personal explanation. There may have been various elements which might have induced the Chief Minister to make a particular statement. But the reason for the same cannot constitute any personal explanation."

III

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE COUNCIL.

1. The Secretary laid on the table copies of—

(i) a G.O. No. 199, Development, dated 3rd February 1928, recording the audit report of the Government Industrial Institute, Madura, for 1926-27.

(ii) a G.O. No. 207, Development, dated 6th February 1928, recording the audit report of the Government Institute, Madura, for the quarter ending 30th June 1927.

2. With reference to the answer to supplementary question to question No. 1448 given at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 25th January 1928, the Secretary laid on the table copies b of the original question regarding the appointment of Oriyas in the Civil Court of Ganjam district and the answer thereto.

IV

MOTIONS ON THE BUDGET FOR 1928-29.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Under sub-rule (2) of rule 29 of the Madras Legislative Council Rules, His Excellency the Governor has been pleased to fix one day as the maximum for the discussion of the motions on each of the following demands, viz., Land Revenue Demand I; Education (Transferred) Demand XIX and Civil Works (Transferred) Demand XXX; and half a day as the maximum for motions affecting each of the other demands. I propose to treat the parts of a day before and after lunch as half a day each.

"Hon. Members will kindly remember that under rule 29 (3) it will be my duty at 5 p.m. on the 30th March to put every question necessary to dispose of all outstanding matters in connexion with the Demands for Grants."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Sir, I would like to know what the time limit, if any, is."

[14th March 1928]

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have carefully examined the question and I do not think there is any Standing Order which enables the President to fix the time limit regarding the debate on the grants and I am not personally inclined to fix any time limit regarding the speeches of hon. Members when the motions on the budget demands are under consideration."

DEMAND I—LAND REVENUE.

* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move

' that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 200.36 lakhs under Demand I. Land Revenue Department.'

* Mr. BASHEER AHMAD SAYEED :—" Sir, I wish to move

' that the allotment of Rs. 33,24,000 for Land Revenue be reduced by Rs. 100.'

"The object of the motion, Sir, has been stated in the list of motions printed and circulated, and that is, to record the disapproval of the settlement policy of the Government. In this connexion, Sir, at this late hour, it is needless for me to repeat all those points which have been urged from time to time against the land revenue policy of this benign Government. In spite of repeated demands to bring the land revenue policy of this Government under popular control, at least under the control of the Legislature, this Government have not taken any serious steps to do so in spite of the promises that have been held out from time to time. Mr. President, it has been the fixed policy of this Government, so far at least as the ryotwari lands are concerned, to assess 50 per cent of the net produce of the cultivator a State demand. That principle has been fixed, in spite of the so-called temporary settlement, as an unalterable principle. The half net principle was fixed as early as 70 or 80 years ago, and times have advanced. Labour has become costly, cultivation has become unprofitable and the net benefit that the ryot derives from cultivation is next to nil. And yet the half net principle has not changed. In other Provinces there have been attempts to change the half net principle and also to bring land under a permanent settlement. In this Province, Government have no doubt several times held out promises and given pledges to bring a sort of permanent settlement for the ryotwari lands and yet they have failed to do so. The intensity and frequency of famines all over India and especially in this Presidency, though not solely due to over-assessment of the land, yet is to a large extent due to the half net principle which leaves nothing for the cultivator to live upon. The assessment is supposed to be equitable in character and moderate in principle, but we see hardly anything of the kind. The proprietor of the soil is not left ordinarily that margin of profit that will enable him to save enough to meet the strain of exceptional misfortune. Government so far have not done anything to make the cultivator more prosperous, more resourceful and better able to help himself in years of bad harvest, especially when he is visited by frequent famines; nor have they done anything to foster agricultural enterprise or to enable the cultivator to accumulate capital in order to invest it in more productive sources of industry and other productive works. Nominally, the principle that has been followed is to take 50 per cent of the net